UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2450th MEETING: 31 MAY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2450)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);	
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2450th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 31 May 1983, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. UMBA di LUTETE (Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2450)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
   Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Maudave (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite Mr. Sam Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2439th to 2444th, and 2446th to 2449th meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, the Gambia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Hadj Azzout (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Woolcott (Australia), Mr. Hashim (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Adjibade (Benin), Mr. Mogwe (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Trucco (Chile), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Suja (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Davin (Gabon), Mr. Blain (Gambia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Gbeho (Ghana), Mr. Taylor (Grenada), Mr. Kaba (Guinea), Mr. Rácz (Hungary), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Serajzadeh (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mrs. Jones (Liberia), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Tan Sri Zainal Abidin (Malaysia), Mr. Traore

(Mali), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Chissano (Mozambique), Mr. Oumarou (Niger), Mr. Bolokor (Nigeria), Mr. Cabrera (Panama), Mr. Jamal (Qatar), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Niasse (Senegal), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Stevens (Sierra Leone), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mr. Owiny (Uganda), Mr. Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bassole (Upper Volta), Mr. Chaderton-Matos (Venezuela), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Mojsov (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Colombia in which he requests to be invited to take part in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite him to take part in the discussion without the right to vote, under relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Albán-Holguín (Colombia) took a place at the side of the Council chamber.

6. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): When, two years ago, the Council considered the question of Namibia, the liberation of that Territory had already been too long delayed.

7. We meet now in 1983 in a context that makes it even more imperative that action be taken sooner rather than later by the United Nations. Within Namibia repression has intensified. This also has external repercussions, in that the number of Namibians now in exile is greater than it ever was. Even in their exile and their refugee camps they are not safe from South Africa's terror. Tension and instability pervade southern Africa as the Pretoria régime steps up its policy of terrorizing its neighbours and those in the region who dare to lend support to the cause of freedom in Namibia. South Africa continues to be in military occupation of part of the territory of Angola. Meanwhile, along with Western transnational corporations, South Africa continues the indiscriminate plunder of the natural resources of the Territory of Namibia, so prejudicing the future development of an independent Namibia.

8. It was an appreciation of this worsening situation that moved the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, in their analysis last March of the situation in southern Africa, to request the convening of this series of meetings of the Council [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 49*]. The high level of participation in this debate, including that of the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, manifests the deep and widespread concern for the early termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia.

9. As we consider again the question of Namibia our minds turn immediately to South Africa's intransigence and non-co-operation. My delegation has never had any doubt that, for South Africa, participation in the negotiating process was but a mere nod to the pressure of community opinion and a means of assuming a posture of co-operation in the hope of easing that pressure. It is clear to us that South Africa's manoeuvres and delaying tactics have been designed only to buy time, so as to find a way of ensuring its continued domination of Namibia while giving the appearance that change will have taken place.

10. But South Africa's intransigence is only one side of the coin. The other side is the permissiveness and the tolerance which has been shown towards South Africa by those States which, by virtue of their extensive trade and other links with the *apartheid* régime, are in a position to pressure South Africa into compliance with the decisions of the Council. South Africa's intransigence is therefore not all home-grown. Each restraint placed upon international action against that régime has contributed to fortifying the belief in Pretoria in its ability to survive and to continue pursuing its policies. Meanwhile, the authority, status and effectiveness of the Council suffer. Our concern is therefore also focused on the role of those who, by their inaction no less than by their action, have facilitated South Africa's intransigence, and on the weakening of the international Organization that naturally follows when those with positions of special responsibility fail to discharge that responsibility.

11. To say that Guyana shares the feelings of dissatisfaction expressed at what has been accomplished so far in the negotiations is to say the very least; and as we look back on the course of those negotiations involving South Africa and five of its major Western trading partners we are naturally tempted to ask ourselves how well principle has fared against national interest throughout that process, how much real serious pressure was placed upon South Africa to comply with the demands of the international community. My delegation has always believed and urged that, in the event of non-compliance by South Africa, the members of the Western contact group had an irreversible obligation to lend their positive support to the adoption by the appropriate organs of the United Nations of effective measures designed to achieve the objectives which those States sought to realize through their joint efforts.

12. We have always held the view that, in this Herculean task in which we are all engaged in respect of South Africa, concern and action must go hand in hand. For the people of Namibia, concern to ensure South Africa's co-operation wears a more credible face when it is at the same time accompanied, and seen to be accompanied, by a consideration of practical measures to be taken in the event of non-co-operation. We are wondering whether the threat was ever made to South Africa that opposition to sanctions would be withheld if South Africa did not show more flexibility. These questions become all the more relevant in view of certain recent developments. I refer, for example, to the embrace in which South Africa is now being held by some, an embrace that mocks the sensitivi-

ties of Africa and the indignation of the international community.

13. The details of the negotiations for the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) are too well known for me to repeat them here. My delegation has taken careful note of the varying assessments of the progress of those negotiations. It is a process, we recall, which has tested to the utmost the patience, the flexibility and the statesmanship of SWAPO, in particular, and of the front-line States; but they have prevailed.

14. While we should avoid giving way to cynicism and despair, we need to be very sober in our assessment of what has been accomplished so far. While we need to approach the future positively, we need to be careful that our spirits are not made to soar too high. How many times have we told, for example, that the breakthrough was just around the corner? We have taken note with appreciation of the efforts of the contact group so far. However, if we have learned anything at all about South Africa in the course of the negotiations, it is the need to be cautious.

15. Quite apart from South Africa's particular approach to the negotiations, which itself has effectively stymied that process, the Pretoria régime is now being freely given another pretext for not co-operating in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), by the introduction of an element that was nowhere envisaged in that resolution and bears no relationship whatsoever to the settlement plan. That element is the withdrawal of Cuban troops.

16. Cuban forces entered Angola following a sovereign decision of the Government of that country. The Government and people of Angola already have tremendous problems defending their sovereignty against South Africa. They deserve our support and solidarity in those efforts. States must refrain from compounding those difficulties.

17. Those who are most directly affected by the insistence on a Cuban withdrawal from Angola as part of a settlement in Namibia are the brutalized and oppressed people of Namibia, for that insistence gives yet another pretext for the Pretoria régime to prolong its presence in the Territory. My delegation would like to urge that in our approach to the solution of the question of Namibia we keep uppermost in mind the interests of the suffering people of that Territory and avoid actions or policies that are inconsistent with the promotion of those interests. In this regard, I must pay a tribute to the Government of France for publicly separating itself from the policy of linkage.

18. For the Organization, which has so resolutely set its face against racism and for which the freedom of peoples is one of its corner-stones, the situation in Namibia constitutes what is perhaps the greatest challenge since its establishment, all the more so since the Territory of Namibia is one for which the United Nations itself has assumed direct responsibility. South Africa's continuing occupation of Namibia and its oppression of the people of that Territory are a stain on the human conscience, an insult to Africa and a threat to peace and stability in southern Africa and indeed to international peace and security. The United Nations and the international community must remobilize political forces in pursuit of the struggle for the liberation of Namibia and for implementation of resolution 435 (1978), which remains the only valid basis for a negotiated settlement of the Namibia question. We feel that the momentum of international action must be regained.

19. In his report on the work of the Organization submitted last September,[1] the Secretary-General observed, among other things, that the Security Council, the organ of the United Nations with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, all too often found itself unable to take decisive action to resolve international conflicts, and its resolutions were increasingly defied or ignored by those who felt themselves powerful enough to do so. He pointed out that the Council too frequently seemed powerless to generate the support and influence needed to ensure that its decisions were respected, even when they were taken unanimously. The Secretary-General did not say it, but members of the Council will agree that the case of Namibia, in particular with regard to resolution 435 (1978), is a demonstration of that weakness to which he refers.

20. Is there another issue on the international agenda on which three major organs of the United Nations have pronounced themselves in such historic concert? In 1971, the International Court of Justice declared South Africa's presence in the Territory of Namibia to be illegal.[2] The General Assembly, in its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, terminated South Africa's Mandate and decided that the United Nations would assume direct responsibility for the Territory. The Council unanimously adopted a resolution approving a plan for South Africa's withdrawal and for the Territory to proceed to independence. Yet, for all this, Namibia continues to be illegally occupied; and the supreme irony is that the representative of the occupying régime is pretending to warn the Council about what kind of decision we should or should not adopt.

21. My delegation is fully in accord with the provisions of resolution 532 (1983), adopted this morning, which mandates the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties to the proposed cease-fire and to report to the Council not later than 31 August on the results of those consultations. We sincerely hope that in the coming weeks those who have influence with South Africa will, in support of the efforts of the Secretary-General, exert the necessary pressure on the Pretoria régime and so make the contribution to freedom in Namibia that their strength and influence have long made possible and that so many have for so long been urging upon them. Should South Africa still continue in its intransigence, there can be no reluctance to impose mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

22. My delegation shares fully the Secretary-General's perceptions on the question of Namibia, as expressed in

the concluding paragraphs of his report [*S/15776*]. We feel his anguish at the tragic delays in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), most recently through the introduction of new extraneous issues. We reassure him of our continuing support and co-operation in his efforts to bring liberation to Namibia and peace to southern Africa.

23. I also wish to express praise to the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Lusaka, for the strong and committed leadership he has been providing to the Council, as the legal Administering Authority for the Territory. We also wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Mishra for his own dynamic contribution to the struggle as United Nations Commissioner for Namibia.

24. After more than three decades of *apartheid*, Africa is impatient. The people of Namibia are impatient, and understandably so, after years of oppression and degradation. The United Nations must reassert its authority in respect of Namibia, and my delegation nourishes the hope that this debate will mark the beginning of the last phase of the efforts of the international community for Namibia's liberation.

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, who was invited by the Council at its 2439th meeting to participate in this debate. I now call on him.

26. Mr. NUJOMA: Mr. President, I am very grateful to you and the other members of the Council for according the delegation of SWAPO the opportunity once again to address this body at this time.

27. My delegation is immensely gratified by the high-level participation in the debate and also by the correct political orientation of the important statements made by nearly all the speakers throughout the debate.

28. We are naturally greatly satisfied at the final outcome of the meeting, which has proved to be timely and significant. In other words, our mission has been accomplished as planned. The agreed objectives which we had set out to pursue here, in close co-operation and co-ordination with the United Nations, are now embodied in the Council resolution just adopted unanimously. This positive action by the Council has further underscored the inevitability of the victory of our just cause over the forces of colonial domination, foreign exploitation, reaction, darkness and death. Today we are happy to note that our cause is the cause of the United Nations, which means the cause of all who cherish peace and uphold justice. On this basis we are confident that, with the solid backing of progressive forces the world over, final victory is certain, for this is the only logical and historically valid outcome of the colonial conflict in Namibia.

29. There is absolutely no question in our minds, as our own liberators, who must continue to bear the heavy burden of the struggle, that we shall win, whether through the bullet or the ballot. This fact has been repeatedly acknowledged by friend and foe alike, including the Boer racists themselves. Thus we are realistic enough to know that it is not one or another resolution that will bring freedom to Namibia. We know that numerous resolutions have been adopted over the years, the implementation of which has been obstinately frustrated by the racist régime of Pretoria. But we also know that whenever the international community, in a clear and categorical way, expresses its support for and solidarity with our people in their heroic struggle, that further strengthens our resolve to carry on and advance the struggle by conquering new heights and expanding the zones of combat inside Namibia.

30. The resounding success which we have been able to score here could not have been possible without creative imagination and the systematic use of strategy behind the scenes and in the course of the consultations, resulting in the text of the resolution adopted by the Council.

31. In this connection, our thanks and appreciation go to all the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and other high officials representing the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement and other friendly countries who participated in the debate, thus lending their enormous prestige to the deliberations. Similarly, we express our indebtedness to all the other representatives who added the convincing voices of their countries in support of our just cause, while sparing no effort and not mincing words in strongly condemning and rejecting the linkage or parallelism that is being unscrupulously injected into the process of the decolonization of Namibia by the United States Administration and the *apartheid* régime.

32. In the same vein, I wish sincerely to thank the initiators of this meeting, that is, the Chairman of the African Group for this month, the representative of the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia. Likewise, I am grateful to the African members of the Security Council for sponsoring my participation in the debate. Needless to say, the presidency of the Security Council by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Zaire and by you, Sir, has been most effective, as can be seen from the resounding success achieved.

33. These are our well-considered sentiments directed to our friends and defenders of the ideals of the United Nations and of the Charter.

34. On the other hand we have our detractors, namely, the collaborators with and apologists for racist South Africa. Their objectives both before and during the meeting were different, and appeared to be to sabotage the meeting, if not to prevent it altogether. A litany of distortions and false rumours was spread in various capitals about alleged progress and it was erroneously intimated that a Council meeting on Namibia at this time would be counter-productive. Well, the overwhelming majority of the States Members of the United Nations thought otherwise and persisted, thus rebuffing this kind of unwarranted manipulation of the situation in Namibia for the sake of the selfish interests of the major capitalist Powers.

35. Having failed in their initial ploy, racist South Africa's friends have sought to use the debate for stonewalling and disinformation, on the cynical basis of "If you cannot beat them, join them". Their statements confirm this, for they were all at variance with what everybody else said.

36. We strongly deplore the fact that, despite the unanimous adoption of the latest resolution of the Council, which, *inter alia*, unambiguously reinforces the mandate of the Secretary-General as the principal authority in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), the so-called contact group should still display the arrogance of power by deciding to hold another of its secret meetings on Namibia on 9 and 10 June in Paris, in order to further its member's deceptive manoeuvres and intrigues.

37. This development, coming as it does immediately after the end of this meeting, is diversionary and, in our view, destructive of the provisions of the latest resolution of the Council.

38. For our part, we most resolutely condemn and reject any attempt on the part of those countries further to complicate the Namibian issue by introducing dangerous and objectionable notions such as so-called general security considerations or other regional problems in southern Africa. Whether used euphemistically or explicitly, linkage in any form at all is totally repugnant and unacceptable to us and to all the African people.

39. We can therefore not afford to remain silent when we see that outrageous schemes are being hatched by the imperialist forces to delay Namibia's independence and to impose on an independent Namibia impediments that would make its sovereignty and territorial integrity a mockery and give *apartheid* South Africa *carte blanche* to commit aggression against Namibia under any conceivable pretext. For these reasons, SWAPO is strongly opposed to the notion of a "cycle of violence", which puts the naked aggression of the racist Boer régime on the same footing as the national resistance of an oppressed people.

40. What SWAPO would like to see is the members of the so-called contact group—especially the three permanent members of the Council—supporting the efforts of the Secretary-General as individual Members of the United Nations rather than constituting themselves a mini-United Nations.

41. In this regard, we urge them to adhere to the letter and spirit of resolution 435 (1978) and, in particular, the provisions of the latest supplementary resolution of the Council, which, in our view, is intended to hasten Namibia's independence.

42. At this juncture, allow me to respond, albeit briefly, to the statement made in this body by the racist representative of the illegitimate régime of *apartheid* South Africa.

43. Even though this was the maiden speech by that particular agent of the *apartheid* régime, his statement was as typical as those of all his predecessors. Their language is usually intemperate, abusive, insulting and belligerent, with generalized threats against the whole world, and their logic is always crooked. It seems that successive spokesmen for the *apartheid* régime are chosen not on the basis of their diplomatic skills or political acumen but strictly on the basis of their Afrikaner bellicosity and their unmitigated rhetoric about reactionary violence and racial arrogance.

44. During this debate, as in all previous ones on this subject in the United Nations, one speaker after another has singled out racist South Africa as the obstacle to Namibia's independence. They have recalled its history of defiance, non-compliance, intransigence and delaying tactics, which is older than the history of the United Nations itself. During the past 37 years, it has resisted and prevented the implementation of the relevant resolutions and decisions of the United Nations, notably those of the Council.

45. The *apartheid* régime is an international outcast. It remains suspended from General Assembly sessions. Had it not been for protection through the Western power of veto in the Council, the racist State would long ago have been expelled from the United Nations. It is a ruthless Fascist State, second only to Nazi Germany, whose model of a racially-inspired repressive State the Afrikaner leaders are trying very hard to emulate. The *apartheid* system has long been condemned as a crime against humanity, and its inhuman practices of institutionalized racism have inflicted and continue to inflict untold suffering on the oppressed peoples both of Namibia and of South Africa itself. All the African people consider that warmongering racist State to be their public enemy No. 1 because of its aggressive, violent and expansionist behaviour in Africa.

46. Time and again, the African front-line States have brought before the Council complaints against the racist régime of Pretoria for its acts of destabilization, unprovoked aggression, subversion and insidious blackmail against them.

47. Furthermore, *apartheid* South Africa has built up a huge military machine in the region, while harbouring hostile intentions against all the black people who inhabit the African continent. Of all the dangers mentioned thus far, the most serious is its introduction into Africa of nuclear technology, if not nuclear weapons themselves, considering the attendant threat to the peace and well-being of all the peoples there and the world over. Since 1915, the Namibian people have been languishing under the military weight of the racist army of occupation, which has recently reached the alarming strength of 100,000 men deployed throughout occupied Namibia.

48. Virtually all the Secretaries-General of the United Nations have, in the pursuit of their duties and responsibilities, repeatedly encountered prevarication and defiance by the racist gangsters in Pretoria. Nobody has ever said anything good about the neo-Nazis of *apartheid* South

Africa in these meeting rooms, save for the occasional lonely voice of one of its major Western trading partners.

49. The whole world stands resolutely opposed to everything that racist South Africa stands for. The African masses of Namibia and South Africa are demanding their birthright: freedom, justice and national independence. Happily, they have the whole world standing behind them in solidarity, and we are convinced that the South Africa racists, like all the others throughout history, are doomed. They have become their own worst enemies. We shall continue to use all the means at our disposal to sharpen the contradictions within their ranks and create favourable conditions for the seizure of power by our people in our beloved fatherland.

50. I do not have much to say beyond this point, except to dismiss with the contempt it deserves the statement delivered here on 24 May 1983 by the spokesman of the non-representative racist State of South Africa. He had the audacity to try to lecture the Council on the legal history of Namibia and other salient issues relating to the decolonization process in Namibia.

51. True to type, he tried to turn reality on its head by using diatribe, omission and invention as he sought to propagate a distorted version of history to suit his racist and colonial interests. Certainly, nobody was either interested in or persuaded by his futile antics.

52. To begin with, the statement put us back to square one in that we were reminded that the Botha régime did not accept the legal authority of the United Nations over Namibia. It follows from this that the régime is still claiming to be administering the Territory "in conformity with the spirit of the lapsed Mandate" [*2440th meeting, para. 71*].

53. In this connection, there is no way in the world this can be true, when 100,000 troops and police are occupying our country. As regards the lapsed Mandate, its terms explicitly directed the Mandatory Power to promote to the utmost the political interest, material and moral well-being and social progress of the Namibians, while creating the necessary conditions for them to accede to full independence through the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination. Of course, this is no longer a contentious point. South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal following the termination of the Mandate in 1966.

54. Contrary to the false claims being made by the Boer régime, it is the Pretoria régime which has obstructed and continues to obstruct Namibia's independence because of its inordinate fear of a SWAPO victory, which in any case is inevitable. It is just a matter of time. It will even be sooner than later.

55. Once again the Council has unanimously agreed that it is the illegal régime of Pretoria that is directly responsible for the non-implementation of resolution 435 (1978). This régime has never shown good faith, nor has it really made an unequivocal and firm commitment to implement that resolution. Any semblance of co-operation on its part with the United Nations was intended only as a public relations show to fit a given situation at a particular time.

56. As far as our struggle is concerned, no amount of threats or aggression will deter us from intensifying the struggle for the total liberation of Namibia. This is our resolve, this is our determination and this is the dedication we must continue to uphold, under the banner of SWAPO, for a free and genuinely independent Namibia.

57. Mr. LICHENSTEIN (United States of America): We have been joined in these important proceedings by many distinguished diplomats from many parts of the world, particularly from the continent of Africa, and, not least, by your distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. President, and our former esteemed colleague. All of us owe you and him thanks for guiding these deliberations with a sure yet flexible hand and with unfailing courtesy and judiciousness. Beyond even yourselves and your country, you have reflected great credit on the Council.

58. The United States is pleased to have been able to vote for the resolution we adopted this morning. We share the common objective of all members of the Council: the swiftest possible attainment of Namibian independence; and we believe that this resolution will make a positive contribution to that end. The United States must point out that the third preambular paragraph refers to several resolutions, among which there was one—Council resolution 435 (1978)—which the United States did not support. Our affirmative vote on the present resolution does not imply any change in the United States position on resolution 435 (1978). With regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, in echoing the comments of the representative of the United Kingdom, I would also note that my Government, although represented at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris, was not a party to its decisions. Together with other members of the contact group, the United States informed the Secretary-General that it would not participate in the decisions of the Conference in view of its role as a member of the contact group in the negotiations aimed at achieving Namibia's independence.

59. Over the past two years and longer, my Government has been deeply involved in the search for a settlement of the Namibia problem. We understand the frustration felt because Namibian independence has not in fact yet been achieved. However, in addition to the very substantial progress that has been made in developing the framework of Council resolution 435 (1978), we believe a great deal has also been accomplished towards establishing an environment in which all parties are able to take the political decisions necessary to implement the United Nations plan. If there is to be a lasting settlement, we need to create the conditions in which all countries in the region—most particularly South Africa and Angola—can feel secure and turn their energies to their own development. This would of necessity involve not only complete respect

for territorial integrity by all countries within the region; it must also involve the withdrawal of all foreign forces in the region. Creating the secure conditions that in turn may provide a climate of confidence will be an essential part of this settlement which we all devoutly wish and towards which we are all earnestly working.

60. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Gabon. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

61. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me first of all to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for having been good enough to allow the delegation of Gabon to take part in the debate on the situation in Namibia.

62. I wish now to fulfil the most pleasant duty of extending to you, Sir, my warmest congratulations on the remarkable way in which you have performed the extremely delicate functions of President of the Council for the month of May. We have appreciated your diplomatic talents, as well as the manner, rigorous and fair, in which you have conducted our proceedings.

63. I wish also to take this opportunity to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, the representative of the United States, for the way in which she conducted the Council's proceeding last month.

64. The delegation of Gabon welcomes the unanimous adoption by the members of the Council at this morning's meeting of resolution 532 (1983). It is a significant step on the path towards a rapid and satisfactory settlement of the Namibian problem.

65. Although we agree with the thrust of this resolution, the adoption of which, in principle, marks the end of the consideration of this agenda item, my delegation believes that the debate is not over, the subject is far from exhausted, and we wish therefore to reaffirm our position here.

66. We have been meeting once again to debate the situation in Namibia. This series of Council meetings was held shortly after the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April. The Conference, in which many States participated—almost all of them represented in this room—set as its objectives the examination of the situation in and relating to Namibia; solidarity with the Namibian people in its struggle for self-determination and national independence in a united Namibia under the leadership of SWAPO; solidarity with and assistance to the front-line States; and measures to be taken to ensure the rapid implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia in accordance with Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978).

67. Africa was, on the whole, satisfied with the results of the Conference because certain principles that it cherishes were reaffirmed, namely, the right to self-determination of the Namibian people; respect for the territorial integrity of Namibia; assistance to the front-line States; denunciation of those who by their support strengthen South Africa; the reminder that Namibia is a direct responsibility of the United Nations; and rejection of the linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. The Government of Gabon wholeheartedly supports those principles.

68. It was on 27 October 1966 that the General Assembly adopted resolution 2145 (XXI) terminating the Mandate that authorized South Africa to administer Namibia and placed that Territory under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. Sixteen years have elapsed since that time, but South Africa, in defiance of that decision and in disregard of international law, continues illegally to occupy the Territory of Namibia and systematically opposes, on the most fallacious pretexts, all proposals for a peaceful settlement that have been made to it. In this way it is doing everything in its power to drive its negotiating partners to extremes and make them, in desperation, acquiesce in confrontation, which provides South Africa with its pretext for complaining about the attacks of SWAPO and the front-line States. One can only wonder whether such an attitude is pure Machiavellianism or the most perverse masochism.

69. Namibia is a geographical entity which forms a whole with Walvis Bay and the offshore islands. But South Africa lives under an *apartheid* régime which delights only in the systematic dividing of peoples according to the good old method of "divide and rule". Thus, Pretoria has introduced into Namibia a whole repressive arsenal of terror composed of arbitrary and racist laws directly modelled on the *apartheid* system itself and a military and police machine marked by ruthless brutality, arbitrary arrests, humiliation, bullying and harassment, and tortures of every description. South Africa is bent on exacerbating ethnic differences the better to be able to manipulate the inhabitants and win them over to its cause. Obviously those tactics are aimed at one objective, that is, doing away once and for all with SWAPO, which is recognized by the international community as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. Once SWAPO was out of its way, South Africa would then be in a position to tighten its grip finally on Namibia through its puppets.

70. Thus we have a policy of annexation and the expansionist ambitions of a country which poses as the defender of democracy and Western values. One can only wonder what the world's democrats think about this: whether they are flattered by so much solicitude or else offended by such unabashed cynicism.

71. Although they live in a country very rich in natural resources, the Namibians are reduced to servitude and poverty. In fact, they are lucky if they receive a tiny proportion of the vast profits earned from the riches of their own soil, profits which serve only further to enrich South Africa, its allies and partners, in flagrant violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia.[3]

72. One would be tempted to think that, in its typical spirit of constant defiance and arrogance, South Africa actually contrives to feed the media and deliberately tries to be on the front of the stage whenever it is put in the dock. That is its own special way of manifesting the disregard and scorn in which it holds the entire international community. That is its own particular way of making anyone who still has any doubts on the subject understand that South Africa has not the slightest intention of obeying international law or associating itself with any genuine process of negotiation aiming at peaceful and equitable solutions.

73. Thus, at the thirty-sixth session when the General Assembly was busy considering the question of the policy of *apartheid*, South Africa carried out a destabilization operation against Seychelles by means of mercenaries for whom gold is more valuable than African lives.

74. During the thirty-seventh session, when the General Assembly was about to debate the question of Namibia, South Africa launched an unjustifiable and murderous attack against the peaceful Lesotho.

75. Today, with the bombing of Matola, it was the turn of Mozambique to be once again the victim of an act of armed aggression by the infuriated racists of Pretoria, who have no respect whatsoever for the sovereignty of States or for the lives of the peaceful peoples that they victimize.

76. One is entitled to wonder about the real feelings of the powerful defenders of South Africa, whose benevolent understanding, if not more or less avowed solidarity, assures Pretoria of impunity and *de facto* immunity. It is not surprising, therefore, that South Africa should evince such scornful arrogance towards the international community as a whole and such sovereign disdain for the resolutions of the United Nations.

77. This is the case with resolution 435 (1978), which approves a settlement plan for Namibia, the spirit and letter of which South Africa is trying to distort by attempting to establish a linkage between the implementation of that plan and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola.

78. The delegation of Gabon categorically repudiates the theory whereby the independence of Namibia would be subordinated to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The presence of these troops results from an agreement which is perfectly valid in international law between Cuba and Angola. Therefore, the linking of the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops constitutes, in the view of my delegation, pure and simple interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

79. Attempts are being made to persuade us that the purpose of this link is to safeguard security, but whose security? The security of South Africa? For, in spite of the presence of Cuban troops on its soil, Angola does not occupy a single square inch of South African territory; it is, on the contrary, South Africa that is occupying an important part of Angolan territory. So we reach a paradoxical situation in which the aggressor, after invading and confiscating the land of others, is crying for help and calling for protection, while the victim is cast in the role of the accused and is supposed to make even more concessions.

80. The Council, which is the most authoritative organ of the Organization, cannot in all decency endorse any further this spurious argument of linkage without damaging its own credibility. In the whole of Africa there are about a half a billion men and women watching us, and we should constantly bear that fact in mind. We are not talking about a rather abstract subject on which we have been invited to make speeches. We are talking about human lives, the lives of men, women and children, who are supposed to be protected by the international law of which the Organization is the very expression.

81. The United Nations should no longer tolerate South Africa's continuing illegal occupation of Namibia or the fact that it is launching from that Territory acts of armed aggression against neighbouring independent States. The Council should compel South Africa to put an end to its dangerous adventurist policy, if necessary by coercive measures such as the mandatory and comprehensive sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

82. Faced with the aggressive and brutal policy of South Africa and the continuance of the illegal occupation of Namibia by the Pretoria régime, this is a responsibility that the members of the Council should have no hesitation in shouldering, particularly those that are members of the contact group charged with implementing the settlement plan for Namibia. It is incumbent upon them to prevail upon South Africa to comply with the provisions of the settlement plan approved in resolution 435 (1978), which, accepted by all, provides, *inter alia*, for elections under the supervision of the United Nations, to elect a Constituent Assembly; the withdrawal of South African troops from Namibia; and the freeing of political prisoners and the abolition of racist laws. This plan remains the sole valid basis for a peaceful settlement, and that is why we call for its immediate and unconditional application.

83. Violence, which as everyone knows breeds violence, has lasted too long and it is high time that it was ended. South Africa must withdraw immediately from Namibia. Whether it likes it or not, it must leave sooner or later. This is the bidding of history, and Pretoria, in spite of the strength of its support and the power of its arms, cannot oppose this inevitable evolution.

84. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Viet Nam. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement

85. Mr. LE KIM CHUNG (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has already had an opportunity, Sir, of expressing its warmest congratulations to you on your assumption of the important office of President

of the Council for the month of May. It is a great pleasure for me to reiterate these congratulations today and to say once more how earnestly we desire the successful fulfilment of your important and noble mission.

86. It is also a great pleasure and a great honour for me to welcome among us such an impressive number of Ministers for Foreign Affairs and other eminent persons, particularly the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, Mr. Paul Lusaka.

87. I have listened very closely and with great respect to the statements made here since 23 May, particularly those of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the front-line and non-aligned countries. I fully endorse the analysis of the prevailing situation in and around Namibia and the evaluation of the background and nature of the question of Namibia as presented here so clearly and in such an exhaustive and judicious manner.

88. My delegation would like to stress forcefully the exceptional seriousness of the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime, which thus far has managed impudently to defy the international legal system, to flout the authority of the United Nations and to treat with contempt the wishes of the international community concerning the achievement of independence by Namibia.

89. My delegation would like in particular to associate itself with the indignation of the President of SWAPO who, before the Council the other day, assailed the *apartheid* junta, which, through its persistent policy of savage repression against the people of Namibia and its policy of aggression and terrorism against neighbouring States, has in cold blood committed a dual crime against humanity and against peace, more than ever justifying immediate and concerted punishment. We also share his indignation at the self-centred and hypocritical policy of the United States and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries, which have publicly espoused the cause of the South African racist State and thereby have become its shameless and notorious accomplices, and must be held directly responsible for the obduracy of the Pretoria régime and for the impasse that the Namibian question has now reached.

90. In accordance with the decisions taken at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held last March at New Delhi [*see S/15675 and Corr. 1 and 2, annex, sect. I, paras. 40-51*], and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April,[4] my delegation also feels that the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, set forth in resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), must be implemented without delay, and for this to be done effectively, the question of Namibia must be brought back fully into the context of the United Nations and placed in the hands of the Council, so that the latter, as a priority, may exercise its authority without foreign interference and again assume full responsibility for the prompt implementation of resolution 435 (1978). We also consider that this time the Council must draw up a precise time-table for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and continue actively to deal with this question until the process has been successfully completed.

91. As was rightly pointed out by the President of SWAPO, the question of Namibia calls for "positive action now, not mere exhortations or empty promises" [*2439th meeting, para. 111*].

92. The people and Government of Viet Nam have consistently given the cause of Namibia their deep understanding and unreserved support, since the objectives and circumstances of this cause are similar, if not identical, to those of the struggle which the people of Viet Nam waged against colonialism and imperialism in order to attain their fundamental national rights, namely, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

93. When a mission of consultation from the United Nations Council for Namibia visited Viet Nam in August 1981, the Government of Viet Nam solemnly reaffirmed in a joint communiqué

> "its principled position of total support for the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people for self-determination, freedom and genuine independence, under the leadership of SWAPO, which is the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people. The Government of Viet Nam strongly supports the struggle of the Namibian people by all available means including armed struggle, the legitimacy of which has been solemnly proclaimed by resolutions of the General Assembly".[5]

94. Government and State leaders and the widest circles of the population and opinion in Viet Nam follow with great concern the situation in and around Namibia and sincerely desire the prompt attainment of independence for Namibia, an end to the unspeakable suffering of the brother people of Namibia and an end to the sacrifices unjustly imposed upon the front-line countries, neighbours of Namibia.

95. We have always taken an active part in the work of international bodies dealing with the question of Namibia, as we did just recently at the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.

96. We have strongly condemned all acts of aggression and destabilization perpetrated by Pretoria against the front-line countries since the illegal occupation in August 1981 of part of Angolan territory, including various criminal raids of Mozambique in January 1981, against Lesotho in December 1982 and again against Mozambique on 23 May, the very day on which the first of the current meetings of the Council devoted to the question of Namibia was held. The spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam on 24 May roundly condemned the South African *apartheid* régime for savagely bombing

the densely populated districts of Maputo, and expressed his conviction that all the criminal adventures of the Pretoria régime would be severely punished.

97. The internal situation in Namibia, as recently presented to us by the President of SWAPO, shows that the "illegal occupiers there have no intention whatsoever of permitting Namibia's accession to independence for a very long time to come". [*Ibid., para. 122.*]

98. While listening to Mr. Sam Nujoma, my delegation recalled the blackest moments of the long and painful war of resistance waged by the Vietnamese people against the United States imperialists for the salvation of their homeland—in fact, similar adversaries, similar criminal designs, almost identical manoeuvres and plans of action. As in the case of South Viet Nam at that time, the enemy of the Namibian people is now seeking at all costs to hold on to Namibia as a neo-colony and to make it a vast garrison, a huge fortress, an immense military base, to serve both as an infernal machine for perpetuating the illegal occupation of the country by the most atrocious repressive terror and as a platform for launching armed attacks against independent African countries, such as Angola, Lesotho, Mozambique, Seychelles, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

99. So the obstacle still looms large on the road to the independence and freedom of the Namibian people. Facts have amply shown that verbal condemnations are not enough to overcome the intransigence of the Pretoria *apartheid* criminals or their protectors and accomplices. It is high time that the international community took energetic action.

100. In deciding to keep actively before it the question of Namibia until the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been fully executed, the Council will have to strengthen the powers of the Secretary-General in order to enable him to carry out with greater intensity a whole range of complex and delicate diplomatic moves, while seriously preparing itself for the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter should the Pretoria régime persist in not hearing reason. The Conference in Paris wisely considered that sanctions are the only means available to the United Nations to make South Africa abide by its decisions.

101. However, my delegation considers that it is necessary that the community of States determine to broaden its assistance of all kinds, including military assistance, to the sole legitimate and authentic representative of the people of Namibia, SWAPO, and to the front-line States in order to strengthen the power of the armed resistance of the people of Namibia on the battlefield and the power of the front-line States to retaliate against the repeated acts of aggression by Pretoria. Our people's experience has been that the forces of international reaction, whether colonialism, imperialism, expansionism or hegemonism, like to use force to terrorize peoples and teach them lessons. We must therefore be ready to meet violence with violence, because that is the cost of final victory for the oppressed peoples. My delegation therefore wishes fully to support the President of SWAPO when he said on 23 May that unless the Security Council acts decisively to secure the withdrawal of South Africa from the international Territory of Namibia the people of Namibia will have no alternative but to continue the armed struggle with greater intensity. [*Ibid., para. 153.*]

102. It is precisely in that spirit that my delegation ends its statement by declaring its firm support for the urgent appeal made by the Secretary-General in his report when he said:

> "I call urgently on all concerned to strengthen and concert their efforts within the framework of the United Nations and to demonstrate the necessary political will to bring about the early independence of Namibia in accordance with the United Nations plan." [*S/15776, para. 20.*]

103. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the German Democratic Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

104. Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): Sir, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to join others in expressing its congratulations on your able handling of the presidency of the Council in the month of May. Your great diplomatic skills and experience have undoubtedly contributed to the accomplishment of the responsible tasks facing the Council.

105. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic has followed with great interest this important and impressive debate, the importance of which is, furthermore, emphasized by the presence and participation of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs and representatives of a large number of States, as well as chairmen of important United Nations bodies.

106. The President of SWAPO, Mr. Nujoma, has convincingly and impressively described the dangers for stability in the region of southern Africa and for peace and security in the world at large arising out of the unsolved problem of Namibia. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic shares the opinion of the overwhelming majority of speakers that the situation in southern Africa has further deteriorated as a result of the escalation of the policy of aggression and terror pursued by the racist régime in South Africa. The *apartheid* régime has been almost unanimously condemned during the debate. At the same time, numerous representatives pointed to the responsibility of the so-called contact group for the persistent delay in the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) and revealed the underlying motives for its manoeuvres. The representatives of only a few States made an attempt to conceal the true causes, to distract attention from the nature of the question and to justify their policy directed against the legitimate interests of the people of Namibia.

107. On the occasion of a friendly visit paid a few days ago by the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe, Mr. Robert Mugabe, to the German Democratic Republic, the Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Mr. Erich Honecker, stated:

> "Africa is a rising continent. It becomes clearly visible there that the advance of the forces of peace and national liberation, despite temporary difficulties, cannot be stopped. Therefore, it cannot cause surprise that the most aggressive imperialist circles make the attempt also on the African continent to turn back the wheel of history. But they will not succeed in doing so. . . . The reasons for the tense situation in southern Africa lie in South Africa's policy of violence. As a part of imperialist global confrontation politics, and with the backing of the United States, this policy aims to subject anew the States and peoples of that region to the old domination."

108. It has also been confirmed during this debate that the dangerous situation in southern Africa is caused by the plotting of imperialist States with the *apartheid* régime in South Africa. While, here at the United Nations, representatives of those States have expressed in high-sounding phrases their desire for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian issue, it is from those same States that weapons and equipment are being supplied for the merciless war that is being waged by the racists against the people of Namibia fighting for their freedom. While representatives of some States members of NATO make statements about the evil of *apartheid*, the transnational corporations of those very States have stepped up their exploitation of the people and the natural resources of Namibia and are drawing millions of dollars of profit from the sweat and tears that result from *apartheid*.

109. To give only one example to prove this, the United States gets from Namibia 98 per cent of its imports of cobalt, 80 per cent of its platinum, 100 per cent of its industrial diamonds, 58 per cent of its uranium, and other important strategic raw materials.

110. Thus the South African racists are simply being encouraged by the open political, military, economic and nuclear assistance given by the United States, Israel, Taiwan and a number of other Western States to continue the illegal occupation of Namibia and to disregard the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Many speakers have quite rightly pointed to the fact that the United States Administration's course of so-called constructive engagement with Pretoria is aimed at the preservation of the military, strategic and economic interests of imperialism and the destabilization of progressive States in the region. Moreover, it is no secret that plans exist for the deployment of medium-range missiles in South Africa, as is intended in Western Europe. The carrying-out of such plans would even further worsen the already tense situation in the region and would have disastrous consequences for world peace and international security.

111. Today the Territory of Namibia has already been transformed into a huge military camp. The report of the United Nations Council for Namibia, entitled "The military situation in and relating to Namibia",[6] reveals the share that the NATO States have in the creation of this large military potential. This document, furthermore, gives evidence of the fact that more than 100,000 soldiers of the South African racist régime and thousands of mercenaries from the United States and other Western countries are operating in Namibia with the aim of oppressing the people of Namibia and of launching aggressive actions against southern African States. As can be seen from the document entitled "Activities of foreign economic interests operating in Namibia",[7] 53 out of the 88 transnational corporations directly involved in the plundering of Namibia have their head offices in capitals of States of the so-called contact group. One can understand only too well why, in view of these facts, many speakers during the debate have voiced doubts about the integrity of the declared intentions of those States.

112. The world public has followed with great concern the escalation of the aggression perpetrated by South Africa from the illegally occupied Territory of Namibia against Angola and other States of the region. Gangs financed and equipped by Pretoria terrorize the population in the front-line States and perpetrate acts of sabotage against industrial installations and communication systems. Assassinations of members of the liberation movements are on the increase.

113. The German Democratic Republic strongly demands the immediate termination of the undeclared war against Angola and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the racist forces from the territory of that sovereign State.

114. The Government and people of the German Democratic Republic strongly condemn the most recent acts of aggression against the capital of Mozambique. In a special statement [*S/15802, annex*], that barbaric raid is denounced as a new expression of the aggressive policy of the South African racist régime against the free peoples of southern Africa.

115. The German Democratic Republic supports all those States which demand that South Africa be forced at last to give up its policy, which endangers peace and security. The imposing of effective sanctions by the Security Council against the *apartheid* régime, the strengthening of the arms embargo and strict control of its implementation and the prevention of all manoeuvres by the racists to find a so-called internal settlement have become much more urgent than ever before.

116. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi in March and the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April, as well as the present debate, have made it very clear that the activities of the self-appointed so-called contact group of Western States have in no way changed the dreadful fate of the oppressed

Namibian people. The racist régime instead has been given a five-year period to escalate its repressive machinery and expand its military and nuclear potential. This has contributed to the aggravation of the situation in Namibia and in the whole region.

117. In this connection, the demand for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations is absolutely justified. Above all, the Council should assume full and direct responsibility for the earliest possible settlement of the question of Namibia.

118. The German Democratic Republic trusts that the Council will take the relevant measures in order to ensure the immediate implementation of United Nations resolutions on Namibia in their entirety, including resolution 435 (1978).

119. My delegation considers the resolution adopted today to be a first step in that direction. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic, furthermore, supports the constructive proposals to that end made by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, and many other representatives of States. My delegation also deems it urgent to determine a precise time-frame for the implementation of further measures aimed at the granting of independence to the Namibian people.

120. We reject very strongly the attempts of the United States Administration to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign States through a policy of linkage and to raise new obstacles to a settlement of the Namibian problem.

121. The German Democratic Republic advocates the independence of Namibia, with the preservation of its territorial integrity, including Walvis Bay and the adjacent islands. It is high time for power to be put into the hands of the Namibian people, represented by SWAPO, the recognized sole and authentic representative of that people. Assistance in solidarity with the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO is part of the responsibility of all States Members of the United Nations for the independence of Namibia. It serves to eliminate a dangerous hotbed of tension and promotes the maintenance and strengthening of world peace.

122. In conclusion, Sir, permit me to reaffirm that the German Democratic Republic will continue to stand alongside the peoples and States of Africa as a true friend and reliable ally. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic will continue to give political, diplomatic and material assistance to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people.

123. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make a statement.

124. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*):Mr. President, first of all I should like to thank you and, through you, the other members of the Council for allowing me the opportunity to take part in the Council's deliberations on the question of Namibia, a question to which Bulgaria, faithful to its consistent policy of support for the right of colonial peoples to self-determination and independence, attaches great importance.

125. I should like also to congratulate you most cordially on your assumption of the important post of President of the Council for the month of May and to express our satisfaction at the excellent results obtained by the Council under your competent leadership.

126. For years the people of Namibia, under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, SWAPO, have been waging their struggle to exercise their right to self-determination and national independence. The legitimacy of that struggle and the aspirations of the people have recognized and reiterated in many General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Without the generous economic, political and military assistance given South Africa by some Western countries, first and foremost the United States, Namibia could have joined the community of independent States a long time ago as a full member.

127. The Bulgarian delegation endorses the objective and thorough analysis of the present context of the problem of Namibia that was made in the statement by the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, and we welcome his personal participation in the work of the Council. The illegal occupation of the Territory is still going on and its militarization by the racist régime is reaching record proportions. The oppression of its people, the detentions, the torture and the arbitrary assassination of patriots continue and grow in number. In its aggressive war against the people of Namibia, Pretoria makes increasing use of the services of mercenaries whom it recruits in several Western countries and incorporates into the racist army. Recently the illegal régime has been taking action to "Namibianize" the war in the Territory, by imposing compulsory military service on the population.

128. South Africa is intensifying its acts of aggression against independent African States. The front-line countries are the main target of such actions. By striving to destabilize their Governments, Pretoria is seeking to create in southern Africa a situation where the people of Namibia would be isolated in their struggle, cut off from the support of their African brothers in the region. The barbarous attack on the capital of Mozambique, Maputo, resulting in casualties among the civilian population of the city, is a recent example of this. The racists continue to occupy part of the territory of Angola and constantly carry out criminal raids against the people of that sovereign State, which has a legitimate Government. The aggression against Angola is also characterized by the fact that it clearly shows the convergence of the aims and interests of Pretoria and of United States imperialism. While South Africa was bringing direct economic and military pressure to bear on Angola, the United States openly stated that the racists had alleged legitimate security interests. The United States Administration has con-

sistently spared no efforts to link the question of Namibian independence with the withdrawal of the Cuban troops who are in Angola at the invitation of that country's Government. All these artificially created obstacles on the path to a just settlement of this problem are not accidental or surprising. For decades the transnational companies of certain Western States have been taking part with Pretoria on an equal footing in the pitiless plundering of the rich natural resources of Namibia. The illegal occupation of the Territory and the inhuman system of *apartheid*, which is rife there, are regarded by the transnational companies as favourable circumstances that enable them to derive as much profit as possible, to the detriment of the people of the Territory.

129. Furthermore, the international community is well aware that the policy of confrontation in international relations and of escalation in the arms race that has been pursued in recent years by imperialist and reactionary circles is also, alas, becoming clear in the case of the Namibian problem and is hampering efforts to solve it in the interest of the people of Namibia. It is precisely this policy of imperialism that is encouraging Pretoria in its obstinate opposition to the will of the international community, as unanimously expressed in the relevant United Nations resolutions.

130. The desired basis for achieving genuine independence for Namibia is clearly set forth in appropriate United Nations resolutions. My delegation is deeply convinced that the question of Namibia can be resolved only by the immediate cessation of the illegal occupation and by strict respect for all resolutions, particularly Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). However, as has been stressed by several previous speakers, we have realized that the activities of the so-called contact group, far from providing a solution to the Namibian question, have in practice given Pretoria the chance to delay and erect more and more obstacles on the path to solution.

131. The Bulgarian delegation is deeply convinced that the Council must step up its efforts to achieve, as soon as possible, the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence. The international community has already realized that South Africa has repeatedly demonstrated its contempt for the decisions of the United Nations. Its policy has been rightly described by the United Nations as a threat to international peace and security. That is why, in the opinion of my delegation, the Council should, in any decision it takes, set a time-limit for the implementation by Pretoria of resolution 435 (1978) and take all the measures provided for under the Charter of the United Nations, including, if necessary, the application of comprehensive, mandatory sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter. This is the way to force the criminal régime to respect the will of the international community and give the people of Namibia the chance to determine their own future freely. My country fully supports the decisions of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently at New Delhi, and the decisions of the OAU on this question.

132. Bulgaria is an active member of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which was set up as the sole legitimate Administering Authority for the Territory until its independence. We shall continue to contribute actively to the Council's efforts to achieve the independence of Namibia, in conformity with United Nations resolutions.

133. We welcome the efforts of the Secretary-General to solve the problem of Namibia in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the world Organization.

134. In his address to the participants in the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held at the end of April in Paris, the President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, stated:

> "Before this lofty forum, the People's Republic of Bulgaria proclaims, once again, its deep solidarity with the courageous struggle of Namibia and its vanguard, SWAPO, while expressing its conviction that the United Nations will not hesitate to redouble its efforts to bring about an equitable solution to the Namibian problem as soon as possible."[8]

135. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

136. Mr. SERAJZADEH (Islamic Republic of Iran): The question of Namibia has been discussed in the Council many times. Some negotiations, through direct and indirect channels, on the right of self-determination and independence of the Namibian people have been in process and the agreements on a just solution and peaceful settlement have been recognized by most Members of the United Nations. Unfortunately, no concrete action concerning the withdrawal of South African forces from Namibia has been taken so far.

137. The lack of harmonious co-operation and a united determination, caused by differences in perspective and goals among the various groups and States, has created a prolonged stalemate regarding the achievement of independence for Namibia. The ineffectiveness of decision-making in the Council has caused the racist régime of South Africa to ignore Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which have been accepted by its members unanimously.

138. The vast economic and military co-operation of the United States with the *apartheid* Government has strengthened the position of South Africa against the oppressed people of Namibia. the United Kingdom's sale of radar equipment to the treacherous régime of South Africa to monitor the rightful activities of the Namibian people against the usurper forces of the white régime postpones their independence. The provision of nuclear reactor facilities by the French colonialists also shows that the use of rhetoric is preferred to any attempt to bring about a peaceful settlement in Namibia.

139. Along with the contradictory conduct of the members of the contact group, the military ties and intelligence links between the Zionist régime of Israel, an imperialist partner, and the racist Government of South Africa preclude a just solution of the problem of Namibia.

140. The Islamic Republic of Iran, with its independent foreign policy based on "neither East nor West", has closely observed the struggle of the Namibian people for independence as well as international negotiations to establish an independent State in the last African colony, Namibia. In the past 15 years, United States Administrations have successfully attempted to protect South Africa because of its minerals and its strategic location on the sea lane.

141. President Nixon and Mr. Kissinger had a systematic, gradual approach towards Africa in general and southern Africa in particular. By subordinating the interests of black Africa and increasing their important ties with white régimes in southern Africa—the former Southern Rhodesia and South Africa—they benefited from the natural resources of those countries for the economic survival of the United States. The revolutions in Angola and Mozambique in 1975, which followed the end of Portuguese colonial power in those countries, brought new realities to southern Africa. The shifting balance of power in southern Africa caused President Carter to adopt his so-called humanitarian policy in dealing with the black majority, who were, and still are, active in liberation movements, particularly in southern Africa—namely, in Namibia and South Africa.

142. The Carter policy, in co-operation with the multinational corporations, worked only to appease the oppressed movements fighting against the *apartheid* régime of South Africa in order further to guarantee the industrial and economic survival of the United States.

143. Now the military and linkage policy of the Reagan Administration, with its irrelevant pre-conditions, has created a new obstacle to a justified settlement of the Namibian independence. That Administration has continued to further its own interests in South Africa by the strengthening of military, economic and intelligence ties, thereby supporting the racist régime's aggressiveness and its continued domination of the Namibian people through overt and shameless intervention in Namibia.

144. The colonialist and imperialist forces, along with the racist usurpers, have for years dominated and plundered the human and natural resources of the African people. The inhuman policies of the "civilized" colonizers, mainly arising from their racist attitude and their superiority complexes, must be taken seriously into account. It is time that all elements, forces and Governments dedicated to the freedom and independence of oppressed peoples condemned the illegal occupation and domination of Namibia by the *apartheid* régime and all its imperialist and Zionist cohorts, and whole-heartedly supported the just and heroic struggle of the Namibian people.

145. In the view of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the aforementioned negotiations and political approaches will only delay the prompt establishment of an independent State and self-determination for the Namibian people. An impartial settlement is only attainable through co-operation among the members of the OAU, the Non-Aligned Movement and SWAPO and the front-line States, within the framework of the immediate implementation of resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). Furthermore, the removal of South Africa from membership in the United Nations would guarantee progress in the attainment of independence by Namibia.

146. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

147. Mr. PELLETIER (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): I am grateful to you, Sir, and to the Council for having given Canada the opportunity of participating in this debate, the subject of which is of crucial importance not only for the people of Namibia but also for the future of the whole of southern Africa. It is a particular pleasure for me to be able to participate under your presidency, in view of the long-standing co-operation between our two countries. I am confident that you will succeed in enabling the Council to produce constructive results and to bring us closer to our objective: freedom and independence for Namibia.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

148. Before turning to that issue, I want to join earlier speakers in expressing dismay at the recent South African attack on targets in Mozambique. Canada condemns that attack in violation of Mozambique's sovereignty, just as it condemns the recent act of violence in South Africa. Both involved loss of life and injury to innocent victims. This pattern must be broken. We know change must and will come in South Africa; we hope it comes soon and in peace. For acts of terrorism and raids across national boundaries can only lead to the heightening of tension in the region and the risk of broader conflict.

149. For us in the Council, these events must also underline the urgent need to end the conflict in Namibia and to implement the United Nations settlement plan.

150. As one of the initiators and drafters of the United Nations settlement plan for Namibia in 1978, Canada deeply regrets that the Council is still seized of the issue five years later and that the people of Namibia are still unable to exercise their right to self-determination. We appreciate and share the concerns of the international community which have prompted the call for this series of Council meetings.

151. Earlier this week, the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir John Thomson, gave a comprehensive account of the negotiating history of this issue [*2439th meeting*]. He outlined the special initiatives that led to the

formulation of the United Nations settlement plan and Council resolution 435 (1978). He spelled out the committed effort undertaken by the contact group following the setback at Geneva to resolve the remaining problems and to clear the way for the implementation of the United Nations plan. I shall not therefore deal at length with the history of the issue. Suffice it to say that the intensive efforts which have been devoted to these negotiations during the past five years have resulted in a substantial body of agreement.

152. That body of agreement has unfortunately fallen short till now of what is needed to secure implementation of a plan which no one challenges in itself. As Sir John suggested, this is not, however, the time to falter in our commitment or our efforts. It is rather a time to persist, to build on what we have already achieved and to succeed.

153. I should like in this context to thank the Secretary-General for his recent report, [*S/15776*], which summarizes the activities of those involved in the negotiations for a settlement over the past two years. All members are well aware that when the Secretary-General took office he identified Namibia as one of his highest priorities. His frequent consultations and expressions of concern for the issue have added to the international pressure for a solution.

154. Recognition should also be given to the dedication shown by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Namibia, Mr. Martti Ahtisaari, and the Secretariat as a whole. The work they have done in preparing for the civilian and military components of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) has contributed immensely to the readiness of the United Nations to undertake the task which will face it on the day of implementation.

155. The special contribution of the front-line States and Nigeria also deserves recognition. They have been unceasing in their efforts and have afforded close co-operation in the negotiations aimed at the early implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The constructive attitude of our African partners has been important throughout our latest talks.

156. Their co-operation enabled substantial progress to be made during the intensive consultations last summer. During those consultations, difficult issues were addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of those involved in the negotiating process in Washington and New York. Understandings were reached on how to ensure the fairness and impartiality of the settlement process and on the deployment of UNTAG. All parties agreed to a set of principles concerning the Constituent Assembly and the Constitution for an independent Namibia. These have been published in a Council document [*S/15287*].

157. As a result of these consultations, the only issues which remain outstanding are, first, the electoral system to be employed in choosing the members of the Constituent Assembly—and the context of the decision has been defined—and, secondly, some technical questions related to the composition of the military component of UNTAG.

158. In the light of the progress made, representatives of the front-line States, Nigeria, SWAPO and the contact group met the Secretary-General on 24 September 1982 to report on the understandings that had been reached and to indicate what remained to be done. It was common to all that insuperable obstacles remained in the context of resolution 435 (1978).

159. Over the years of these negotiations, many issues have been addressed by one side or the other. Many obstacles have been overcome through discussions involving the United Nations, the front-line States, SWAPO, South Africa and the contact group. The legitimate interests of all the parties involved in the settlement plan have been weighed and taken into account.

160. These efforts have been made against the background of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory. What remains to be achieved is its acquiescence and participation in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

161. As the Secretary-General has pointed out, South Africa has raised another issue in the region—outside the mandate of the contact group—a condition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). These two matters have a relationship only in so far as one of the parties chooses to draw them together. Canada for its part does not accept the concept that the resolution of one should be conditional upon the resolution of the other. It is none the less evident that these regional security concerns exist and pose an obstacle. We understand they are being dealt with separately in bilateral talks. We hope that they may be resolved quickly with full respect for the sovereignty of the States concerned and that the people of Namibia may be given the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination.

162. Our regret at past delays in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) does little to comfort those who must still face dislocation, conflict and the denial of political and human rights in Namibia. It is against this background that I should like to make three points.

163. The first is that an immediate peaceful settlement is unquestionably in the best interests of all of the people of Namibia and of the countries bordering Namibia, including South Africa. That must be our guiding consideration. There is no other factor that can have equal weight with my Government or with the Council.

164. Secondly, it is not a question of whether Namibia will achieve independence. It is a question of how soon it will do so and under what conditions. Canada will continue to exert its best efforts to ensure that the transition to independence comes soon and in conditions of peace.

165. That brings me to my third point. The people of Namibia have suffered in recent years not only from con-

tinuing conflict but also from conditions of uncertainty and protracted drought. They will face many challenges following independence, including the momentous challenge of developing their country and bringing benefits to all of its people. My Government's hope is that they may be enabled to address those challenges in the context of co-operation within the region and with the support of all the countries which have shown a lively interest in the future of Namibia.

166. So far as Canada is concerned, I wish to leave no doubt that we should be happy to develop measures of economic co-operation with an independent Namibia, as we have with Zimbabwe and other countries following their independence. We look forward to that opportunity and also to the prospect of stability in the region. For we believe that the establishment of an independent and fully representative Government in Namibia and the end of conflict will also increase opportunities for economic co-operation throughout the region.

[*The speaker resumed in French.*]

167. Finally, I would say to all those who have been following the debate that we envisage for this region a future that will make it possible to strengthen peace and security in southern Africa, despite the fears and the mistrusts that today are impeding progress. Those of us who have sought a peaceful and negotiated solution in Namibia will not lose interest once that objective has been attained. I should like to recall in this context that the Commonwealth Heads of Government in 1975 stated that they were ready to have Namibia join them after independence. I am convinced that they would be only too happy soon to receive a reply to their invitation from the Government of a free and independent Namibia. Bearing in mind the very special responsibility borne by the United Nations and the Council with regard to Namibia, my Government hopes that this debate and the already assured adoption of a constructive resolution will speed up the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The people of Namibia deserves peace and independence. They must be allowed to decide their own fate as soon as possible.

168. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Mexico. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

169. Mr. MUÑOZ LEDO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is fortunate that this debate is taking place under the presidency of a distinguished and eminent African whose diplomatic gifts have earned him the esteem and respect of the United Nations. We should like to thank him most fraternally—as well as the other members of the Council—for giving us the opportunity to speak today.

170. Mexico's militancy in the matter of the struggle for decolonization has been a corner-stone of its foreign policy, hence our active participation in efforts to secure the independence of Namibia and the elimination of *apartheid*, as well as our efforts to isolate the Pretoria régime in order to ensure respect for human rights in that country and the freedom of the peoples of southern Africa.

171. We have repeatedly denounced the flagrant violation of the international legal order represented by the occupation of Namibia and the consequent defiance of the authority of the United Nations and affront to Member States, particularly those which have accepted the responsibility of being members of the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, in spite of its efforts, has not succeeded in fulfilling its functions as the Administering Authority for the Territory.

172. My country has scrupulously observed the oil embargo; we have striven to make the arms embargo effective and have come out in favour of the application of appropriate measures to end the support and supplies enjoyed by the Pretoria régime.

173. As far back as last September, we came to the Council to ask for the adoption of the conclusions and recommendations of the report submitted in 1980 by the Security Council Committee established by resolution 421 (1977) concerning the question of South Africa [*S/14179*], over which my delegation had the honour of presiding. Unfortunately, our request was not granted and with the continuance of the violation of the embargoes there has been a strengthening of South Africa's impunity, which lies at the very base of its occupation of Namibia.

174. The impatience of the international community at the slow pace of the Namibian independence process is more than justified. The optimism aroused by the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) has now turned into general frustration. There is every ground for believing that the path taken so far should be substantially changed and that respect for the will of the Council should be enforced through the means provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

175. The delegation of Mexico has taken this stand for some years now. In May 1980, at the extraordinary plenary meetings of the United Nations Council for Namibia, held at Algiers, we pointed out that the time-limits we had granted to the Pretoria régime had expired and that South Africa must without delay comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We asserted that there was no longer any reason for waiting and we should not wait.

176. It was clear then that the Pretoria régime had set in train and alternative strategy aimed at replacing the United Nations plan by another of a neo-colonialist type, based on the exclusion of the authentic fighters for independence and the strengthening of its regional hegemony.

177. In June 1980, we referred in this forum to the web of international complicity developed by South Africa and the great success it had achieved in managing to have its own interests included in global strategies and fears. We observed that, thanks to that support, the Pretoria régime

had demonstrated its hostility to the United Nations plan and had increased its efforts to consolidate its illegal occupation. [*See 2229th meeting, paras. 10 and 12.*]

178. In January 1981, in the face of the failure of the Geneva pre-implementation meeting, we suggested here that the South African Government perhaps had some grounds for supposing that there did not exist a genuine commitment on the part of all Member States to the independence plan. Three months later [*2274th meeting*], we stated that the limits of tolerance had already been exceeded and called on the Council to take immediate decisions to safeguard its honour and future.

179. At that time we were facing the danger of acceptance of a thesis—the London memorandum—which referred to measures giving "greater confidence to all of the parties on the future of an independent Namibia" [*S/14457, annex*]. Acceptance of that argument would mean contradicting squarely the principle of self-determination and supporting a correlation of forces favourable to the occupying country.

180. There were two options facing the Council: to grant further concessions to South Africa or to exert effective pressure on South Africa. It was indispensable to make it clear to the Pretoria régime that the flexibility of the front-line States and SWAPO was not to be taken as a sign of weakness and that the action recommended to the Western Powers was not susceptible of any ambiguity.

181. When our appeal was not heeded and decisions called for by the events were not taken, the Council gave an equivocal sign of greater tolerance towards South Africa and opened up a new chapter in the occupation, based now on allegedly ideological reasons.

182. In March 1981, in the plenary General Assembly, my delegation referred to the growing practice of seeking to impose unilateral solutions on problems that were within the competence of the Organization. It was necessary, we said, to adopt a new course of action and to bring to bear all the means at our disposal to exert constant pressure on Pretoria and those States which were encouraging and supporting the South African régime in its obstinate defiance of the international community.[9]

183. We asserted that the presence of South Africa in Namibia was something which had been acquiesced in by those who could have prevailed upon South Africa to cease its occupation. We thought the time had come to make a decision: either to comply with the principles of the Organization, or to sacrifice a few States on the altar of expediency.[10]

184. We also pointed out that the battle for decolonization should not be affected by a narrow bipolar conception of the world, and that the recrudescence of international tensions were having a very severe effect on the activities of the United Nations, in this and other regions, which suddenly found themselves raised to the rank of strategic border zones.[11]

185. In May of that same year, in the course of the International Conference on Sanctions against South Africa, held in Paris, we stressed the need to avoid the raising of considerations of a global nature which distorted the actual nature of the problem. We said that the issue was that of putting an end to colonialism in Africa, which should in no way be allowed to be confused with super-Power rivalry. The best way of maintaining international security, we added, was by saving the peoples and territories of the third world from conflicts which were alien to them.

186. In September 1981, at the eighth emergency special session of the General Assembly, we rejected the theses that attempt to reduce revolutionary movements of developing countries to mere conspiracies or mechanical reflections of the East-West confrontation. We repeated our warning against hegemonic solutions: we came out in favour of the peaceful way of resisting conflicts in southern Africa, the Middle East and Central America, while safeguarding in all cases the principles of the Charter and the competence of the United Nations.[12]

187. We have ventured to offer this summary of the facts and positions because we believe that in this case history is particularly illuminating. The path of concessions to South Africa clearly was not leading to the independence of Namibia, and this problem, whose origins are as clear as its nature is undisputed, has thus become blurred; indeed, it has been diverted into a struggle for world dominance.

188. The decisions adopted by the General Assembly and by the Security Council do not admit of interpretations and commit all States. On few occasions has right and morality been so clearly defined in a matter of self-determination. Whatever element or condition may be added to the resolutions adopted, it is just a pretext for prolonging colonial domination.

189. We still have time to change our course. My delegation welcomes the decision adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement, which initiated this debate. We also welcome the overwhelming participation of Member States and the high quality of their statements, which without any doubt reflect the will of the international community.

190. The report of the Secretary-General [*S/15776*] is proof of his interest in the subject and his good judgement. It contains observations which warrant our serious consideration, in particular his expression of regret that the process has been set back by the emergence of other issues which were neither raised nor envisaged at the time resolution 435 (1978) was adopted, or in the subsequent negotiations, and that factors outside the scope of that resolution should hamper its implementation.

191. My Government is pleased that the Secretary-General considers the question of Namibia as a special responsibility in the light of its importance to international peace and security. In so doing, he is renewing the commitment to bring to bear his authority in the peace-

ful solution of controversies and in support of efforts at negotiation to be undertaken by Member States in keeping with the Charter.

192. The resolution unanimously adopted this morning contains elements that are indispensable for initiating a new course of action. We trust that a correct reading of it will serve to reject any idea of linkage or parallelism with regional or global situations, arguments that have been used as an excuse for continuing to violate adopted decisions.

193. My delegation wishes to take this opportunity to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia upon its efforts, so far inconclusive, and to repeat our firm solidarity with the Governments and peoples of Africa, which, in spite of acts of aggression, interference and reprisals, have persisted in their heroic struggle against domination.

194. The Security Council should remain vigilant, ever prepared to take the necessary measures if its resolutions are not promptly complied with. It is essential to prevent the prevailing neo-colonialist designs and ambitions from becoming the norm in relations between powerful States and their neighbours. It is necessary to avoid, in this and other regions of conflict in the world, a situation where hegemonic interests are pursued in defiance of the norms of international law and the will of the United Nations.

195. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The last speaker is the representative of the United Nations Council for Namibia, to whom the Security Council issued an invitation at its 2439th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

196. Mr. LUSAKA: Mr. President, I thank you once more for calling on me. Our debate on the question of Namibia is now coming to a close. May I also thank your Minister for Foreign Affairs and you personally for the efficient way in which both of you have guided our deliberations. We have all benefited from your wisdom and experience.

197. Our thanks go also to the delegations that joined us in these deliberations, especially the Ministers for Foreign Affairs who have travelled to New York to participate in the debate. The level and quality of participation, not to mention the number of speakers, have demonstrated the global importance of the question of Namibia.

198. When I addressed this Council at its 2439th meeting, on 23 May, I stated that our major objective for coming to the Council was to call on it to reassert its authority in the implementation of the United Nations plan for Namibia as approved in resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). We urged that all consultations on the implementation of this plan should be conducted within the United Nations framework.

199. Nearly all of the speakers who have addressed the Council during our deliberations have stated their commitment to the early attainment of independence by Namibia. We hope we can anticipate the same from those who have yet to speak. Nearly all of us have spoken in a measured and restrained tone. However, let no one misread our restraint as a sign of weakening in our support for the struggle of the Namibian people for independence. We stated that we had not come here for confrontation. We stated that all of us should join together in finding ways to implement the United Nations plan on Namibia.

200. In resolution 532 (1983), adopted by the Council this morning, the Council decided to mandate the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties concerned with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Council requested the Secretary-General to report to it on the results of these consultations not later than 31 August 1983. The resolution further called upon South Africa to co-operate forthwith and fully with the Secretary-General in order to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) for the early independence of Namibia.

201. A review of the statements made in the Council in favour of Namibia's independence shows that they contain a common element. There is unanimity with regard to the essentials concerning the implementation of the United Nations plan on Namibia, which every one of us has accepted as the only basis for an internationally-recognized settlement. This unanimity of views is also reflected in the assessment as to how the implementation of the United Nations plan has hindered by issues that are extraneous to the plan itself.

202. I wish to refer to two statements made in the course of this debate. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government agreed with the Secretary-General in reporting that "—as far as the United Nations is concerned the only outstanding issues are the choice of the electoral system and the settlement of some final problems relating to UNTAG and its composition". [*2439th meeting, para. 55.*] He also categorically stated that "These are indeed the only outstanding problems under resolution 435 (1978)." [*Ibid.*]

203. The second statement I should like to refer to is that of the representative of the United States. She stated:

> "Because of the substantial progress that has been made over the past two years, only two major issues remain to be resolved in preparation for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). These are: the choice of the electoral system to be employed in the elections, which all parties are agreed must be settled in accordance with the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) and in a manner that does not cause delay; and final technical matters concerning the composition of the military component of UNTAG.
>
> ". . .
>
> "We share the concern that the factors relating to the regional situation in southern Africa, which are,

however, outside the scope of the mandate of the contact group have not yet permitted implementation of the United Nations plan." [*2443rd meeting, paras. 186 and 189.*]

204. In these remarks we perceive a clear acceptance by the United States of the fact that extraneous issues that are irrelevant to the question of Namibia are hindering the progress towards the attainment of independence by Namibia.

205. Both the United Kingdom and the United States representatives referred to the suffering of the people of Namibia and to the sense of frustration. So, if they do indeed sympathize with the people of Namibia in their quest for liberation, they should translate this sympathy into action, and do so now.

206. No one in history has succeeded for long in suppressing the yearnings for freedom that emanate from oppressed people. There are those who in the not-too-distant past vowed that freedom for the people they oppressed would not come in their lifetime. Yet they have lived to see themselves being proved wrong. What has happened elsewhere will certainly happen in Namibia.

207. But it is our duty to see that the independence of Namibia does not cause more bloodshed, more refugees, more suffering, more loss of life. We have a plan, the United Nations plan, that guarantees a peaceful transition of Namibia to independence. We all accept it and agree on its essentials. What then are we waiting for? If we are collectively to shoulder our responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations we must act together now in the interest of the liberation of Namibia.

208. Nearly three score speakers have come before the Council to manifest how peace and freedom for Namibia are an integral part of international peace and security. They, like us in the United Nations Council for Namibia, have called for an immediate end to the illegal occupation of Namibia. They, like us, have called on Pretoria to make a firm commitment as to its readiness to comply with Security Council resolution 435 (1978). They, like us, have called for the fullest measure of co-operation with the Secretary-General in order to expedite the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). As we anxiously await the report of the Secretary-General to this body by 31 August, we shall remain vigilant. In our painful vigil we shall draw comfort from the fact that the question of Namibia is now back where it belongs internationally: within the United Nations framework.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.

NOTES

[1] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 1.*

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[3] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, Vol. I, annex II.

[4] See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris*, 25-29 April 1983 (A/CONF.120/13), part three.

[5] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 24*, part three, chap. II, sect. 5(b), para. 11.

[6] A/CONF.120/3–A/AC.131/91 and Corr. 1 and 2.

[7] A/CONF.120/4–A/AC.131/92.

[8] See *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris*, 25-29 April 1983 (A/CONF.120/13), annex IV, sect. A.1.

[9] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 109th meeting, paras. 173 and 175.

[10] *Ibid.*, paras. 182 and 183.

[11] *Ibid.*, paras. 192–194.

[12] *Ibid., Eighth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 9th meeting, paras. 30–39.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من مكتبتك أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店查询或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-60205—April 1991—2,050